

### **REMARKS**

Claims 32-52 are pending in the application. Applicant notes that the prior response added new claim 52 on page 6 of the amendment, but the Office apparently overlooked the addition of such claim since only claims 32-51 are addressed in the Office Action. Applicant requests consideration of claim 52. Applicant expresses appreciation for the indication on pages 5-6 of the Office Action that claims 34, 35, 38, 39, 42, 43, 47, and 48 set forth allowable subject matter.


Claims 32, 33, 36, 37, 40, 41, 44, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim (U.S. 6,391,803). Applicant requests reconsideration. Applicant notes that the effective date of Kim as a reference is June 20, 2001 while the present application has a priority date of August 31, 2000. Accordingly, Kim is not prior art to the present application. Page 3 of the Office Action acknowledges that Lee does not teach every limitation of the rejected claims and relies upon Kim as allegedly providing the missing subject matter. Since Kim is not prior art, the rejected claims are patentable over Lee in view of Kim. Applicant requests allowance of all rejected claims in the next Office Action.

Claims 45, 46, 49, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Kim and in further view of Wolf. Applicant requests reconsideration. As may be appreciated from the discussion herein, Kim is not prior art to the present application and the rejected claims are patentable over Lee in view of Kim and in further view of Wolf. Wolf does not remedy the deficiencies of Lee that are allegedly disclosed in Kim. Applicant requests allowance of the rejected claims in the next Office Action.

Applicant herein establishes adequate reasons supporting allowance of all pending claims 32-52 and requests allowance of such claims in the next Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 17 Sep 2003

By:   
James F. Lake  
Reg. No. 44,854